



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/899,554

07/05/2001

Arul A. Menezes

M61.12-0366

1641

27366

7590

02/06/2008

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)

SUITE 1400

900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/899,554

Applicant(s)

MENEZES ET AL.

Examiner

Huyen X. Vo

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 24-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14-23 and 32-41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/5/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-13 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meyers et al. (from IDS submitted 11/4/2002).

3. Regarding claim 1, Meyers et al. disclose a computer-implemented method of associating dependency structures from two different languages on a tangible computer readable medium, wherein the dependency structures comprise nodes organized in a parent/child structure, the computer-implemented method comprising:

associating nodes of the dependency structures to form tentative correspondences on the tangible medium (*section 4.2, page 3, particularly the second term on the right hand side of equation 2; describing all possible correspondence between elements of the source language and elements of the target languages; source and target trees are dependency structures*);

aligning nodes of the dependency structures as a function of at least one of eliminating at least one of the tentative correspondences and structural considerations on the tangible medium (*section 4.2, page 3, particularly equation 2; all possible*

correspondence or pairings of the source language and target language are evaluated and the pairing with maximum score is the selected; eliminating all other pairings); and providing an output from a computer indicative of the alignment of the dependency structures (section 4.2, page 3, pairing with maximum score is selected).

4. Regarding claim 24, Meyers et al. disclose a computer-implemented method of associating dependency structures from two different languages stored on a tangible computer readable medium, wherein the dependency structures comprise nodes organized in a parent/child structure, the computer-implemented method comprising:

aligning nodes of the dependency structures with correspondences on the tangible medium as a function of a set of rules, the rules being applied to the nodes initially irrespective of the parent/child structure (section 4.2, page 3, particularly equation 2; aligning all possible correspondence of the source language and target language; for rules, referring to sections 5-6); and

providing an output from a computer indicative of the alignment of the dependency structures (section 4.2, page 3, pairing with maximum score is selected).

5. Regarding claims 2-8 and 25, Meyers et al. further disclose the computer-implemented method wherein associating includes forming tentative correspondences comprising direct translations (*section 4.2, page 5, select the maximum scored pair is direct translation*), wherein associating includes forming tentative correspondences comprising translations of morphological bases and derivations (*section 3, page 2*),

wherein associating includes forming tentative correspondences comprising bases and derived forms of translations (*section 3, page 2*), wherein associating includes forming tentative correspondences between nodes wherein one of the nodes comprises more lexical elements than the other node (*figure 2*), wherein said one of the nodes is a single word in one of the languages and said other node comprises at least two words in the other language (*figure 2 or referring to section 6*), wherein aligning pursuant to structural considerations comprises aligning nodes as a function of a set of rules (*sections 5-6*), wherein each of the rules of the set of rules are applied to the dependency structures in a selected order (*sections 5-6*).

6. Regarding claims 9-11 and 27-29, Meyers et al. further disclose the computer-implemented method wherein each of the dependency structures comprise a set of unaligned nodes and wherein each of the rules are applied successively to the set of unaligned nodes until a set of aligned nodes is identified, then the nodes of the set of aligned nodes are removed from the set of unaligned nodes and each of the rules of the set of rules is again applied successively to the set of unaligned nodes (*Greedy algorithm in section 5, page 4, steps 1-5, particularly step 2-3*), wherein one rule of the set of rules comprises aligning a set of nodes if a bidirectionally unique translation exists (*sections 5-6*), wherein one rule of the set of rules comprises aligning a pair of parent nodes, one from each dependency structure having a tentative correspondence to each other, if each child node of each respective parent node is already aligned to a child of the other parent node (*section 4.2, page 3*).

7. Regarding claims 12-13 and 30-31, Meyers et al. further disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 8 wherein one rule of the set of rules comprises aligning a pair of child nodes, one from each dependency structure, if a tentative correspondence exists between them and if a parent node of each respective child node is already aligned to a corresponding parent node of the other child (*figure 2, and right column, page 3, mapping between parent nodes v and v'*), wherein one rule of the set of rules comprises aligning a pair of nodes, one from each dependency structure, if respective parent nodes of the nodes under consideration are aligned with each other and respective child nodes are also aligned with each other (*sections 5-6, greedy algorithm*).

8. Regarding claim 26, Meyers et al. further disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 24 wherein later rule applications use an alignment created by an earlier rule application as a reference point that is used to disambiguate between competing alignments (*section 4.2, page 3, particularly equation 2; all possible correspondence or pairings of the source language and target language are evaluated and the pairing with maximum score is the selected; eliminating all other pairings*).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 14-23 and 32-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HXV

1/25/2008

